(b) Nitrofurazone cream

4. Lynestronol

5. Piperazine

6. Oxyphenbutazone/phenylbutazone

7. Analgin (Dipyrone)

Production and export of Fertilizers and Pesticides

2173. SHRI RAMACHANDRA KHUNTIA: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether production of various chemical fertilizers and pesticides had increased during the last three years;

(b) if so, the details thereof, quantity-wise and type-wise; and

(c) the quantity of these fertilizers and pesticides exported during the same period?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI RAMESH BAIS): (a) to (c) Yes, sir. There has been increase in indigenous production of fertilizers. Product-wise details of production and export of chemical fertilizers during the last three years have been as under:

(in Lakh MT)

Name of	1997-98		1998-99		1999-2000	
Product	Production	Export	Production	Export	Production	Export
Urea	185.96	0.20	192.91	0.40	198.30	0.01
A/S	5.44	—	5.51	—	6.03	—
CAN	4.41	—	4.67	—	3.18	—
A/C	1.10	—	0.63	—	0.88	—
DAP	36.91	—	38.68	—	38.63	—
SSP	31.39	0.37	34.07	0.88	32.05	—
Complexes	35.18	—	37.74	0.0004	50.01	—

The details of production and export of various pesticides during the last three years are given in statement.

Statement

*Production of various Types of pesticides during last three years:**

(Qty '000' Mt)

S.No	Type of Pesticides	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
1	DDT	4.2	3.4	3.6
2	Malathion	4.7	5.2	5.9
3	Mthyl Parathion	2.3	2.3	1.9
4	Monocrotophos	11.7	10.2	9.7
5	Endosulphan	7.8	8.4	8.3
6	Cypermethrin	3.0	3.2	3.7
7	Chlophyriphos	3.6	7.2	7.5
8	Others	26.1	28.0	28.0
9	Carbendazim	0.8	0.8	0.9
10	Mencozeb	7.0	8.3	10.3
11	2,4-D	1.5	2.1	1.3
12	Butachlor	0.4	0.6	0.7
13	Isoporoturon	6.0	5.6	4.6
14	Glyphosate	1.1	1.3	1.7
15	Zinc Phosphide	0.5	0.6	0.5
16	Alluminium Phosphide	1.5	2.0	1.8

*The above figures are based on the information provided by those units whose production is being monitored by the Monitoring and Evaluation Cell of the Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals. The figures are for only the major items and do not include the entire range of product being manufactured in the country.

Export of pesticides during last three years 1996-97, 1997-98 & 1998-99:

(Qty 'im' MT)

S.No	Industry	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
1	2.4.D	315	233.0	608.7
2	Methyle Bromide	22	40.6	—
3	Parathion Methyl	362	392.2	73.0
4	Cypermethrin	1956	2159.8	2423.8
5	DDT	54	133.3	174.9
6	DDVP	532	263.0	148.2
7	Dimethoate	111	83.6	211.6
8	Endosulphan	2301	1761.3	2751.4

S.No	Industry	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
9	Fenthion	111	207.2	26.3
10	Isoproturon	2879	1255.1	1047.2
11	Lindane	557	281.6	176.1
12	Malathion	1036	1321.0	1345.0
13	Quinilphos	351	237.6	186.0
14	Aluminium Phosphide	662	1421.5	—

Source: DGCIS, Calcutta—Ministry of Commerce

Energy efficiency in urea plants

2174. SHRI ANANTRAY DEVSHANKER DAVE: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) the amount of subsidy that could be saved if gas-based fertilizer plants were to operate on energy efficiencies, compared to the world's best gas-based urea plants; and

(b) the amount of subsidy that could be saved if the naphtha-based fertilizer plants were to operate on energy efficiencies, compared to the world's best naphtha-based urea plants?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI RAMESH BAIS): (a) and (b) The energy efficiency of Indian gas based fertilizer plants having regard to their age, technology, quality of indigenous gas supply and ambient conditions amongst other factors is close to those which are best achievable in the country. Similarly, the energy efficiency of naphtha based plants depend on vintage, technology used, ambient conditions and other related factors. The average energy consumption for naphtha based plants in the country was 7.34 mkcal/tonne urea during 1999-2000. However, two naphtha based plants which were commissioned recently have attained an energy consumption of around 6.10 makcal/tonne of urea which can be considered close to the best achiveable under Indian conditions. Factors narrated above coupled with non-availability of authentic figures for most efficient urea and naphtha plants in the world make it difficult to make any reasonable assessment of the saving in subsidy that could have been effected.